

REMARKS

The present Amendment amends claims 88, 96 and 104 and leaves claims 89-95 and 97-103 unchanged. Therefore, the present application has pending claims 88-104.

In the September 4, 2003 final Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 89-99 and 104 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Crawford (U.S. Patent No. 5,771,354) in view of Attanasio (U.S. Patent No. 5,668,943) and rejected claims 100-103 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Crawford and Attanasio in view of the Examiner's alleged well known features of a computer program product. As set forth in the January 5, 2004 Response, the arguments presented therein being incorporated herein by reference, these rejections were traversed for the following reasons. Applicants submit that the features of the present invention as now recited claims 88-104 are not taught or suggested by Crawford, Attanasio or the alleged well known features of a computer program product whether taken individually or in combination with each other as suggested by the Examiner. These same arguments apply since the rejection of the claims remain the same. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw these rejections.

In response to the January 5, 2004 Response, the Examiner issued an Advisory Action on January 22, 2004 in which the Examiner alleges that the Response will not be entered and was considered but does not place the application in condition for allowance being that the Examiner alleges that:

"in response to Applicants arguments that the references fail to show certain features of Applicants invention, it is noted that the features upon which Applicants relies (i.e., "a disk request processing section is separate from the CPU of the computer", Paper #18, page 9, paragraph 2) are not recited in the rejected claims"

Applicants do not agree with this assessment by the Examiner. Each of the claims specifically recite a separate processor and disk request processing section. However, in order to expedite this matter each of the independent claims were amended to recite that the disk request processing section is separate from the processor. Therefore, this limitation is specifically recited in each of the claims and as such are supported by the arguments presented in the January 5, 2004 Response, which as noted above were incorporated herein by reference, as well as the specification and drawings, particularly Fig. 1.

Therefore, the features of the present invention as recited in the claims are clearly not taught or suggested by Crawford, Attanasio or the alleged well known features of a computer program product whether taken individually or in combination with each other. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that claims 88-104 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of claims 88-104 is respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, the applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, to the deposit account of Antonelli, Terry, Stout & Kraus, LLP, Deposit Account No. 01-2135 (501.34424CX2).

Respectfully submitted,

ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP



Carl I. Brundidge
Registration No. 29,621

CIB/jdc
(703) 312-6600